ENGINEERING-SCIENCE, INC. a unit of
PARSONS ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.
1700 Broadway, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80290
phone: (303) 831-8100 ● telecopy (303) 831-8208

MEETING NOTES

TO: Distribution **DATE:** September 20, 1994

FROM: Philip Nixon **PROJECT:** Solar Pond IM/IRA

MEMO #: SP307:092094.01

ATTENDANCE:

Phil Nixon
Harlen Ainscough, CDPHE
Arturo Duran, EPA
Frazer Lockhart, DOE
Shaleigh Whitesell, PRC
Andy Ledford, EG&G
Peg Witherill, DOE/SAIC
Mike Bretz, EG&G
Patrick Kadel, G&M

DISTRIBUTION:

Randy Ogg, EG&G
Mark Austin, EG&G
Michelle McKee, EG&G
Steve Keith, EG&G
Steve Cooke, EG&G
Toni Forbes, EG&G
R. Popish EG&G (Admin. Record) (2)
Steve Howard, DOE/SAIC
Scott Surovchak, DOE
Jeff Ciocco, DOE
Jesse Roberson, DOE
Bob Siegrist, LATO
Alan McGregor, ERM
John Haasbeek, ERM
Marcia Dibiasi, IGO
L. Benson
P. Breen
B. Cropper
K. Cutter
W. Edmonson
T. Evans
H. Heidkamp
R. Henry
M. Hill
P. Holland
S. Hughes
R. McConn
D. Myers
A. Putinsky
R. Stegen
S. Stenseng
R. Schmiermund
B. Glenn
R. Wilkinson
T. Kuykendall
Central Files

SUBJECT: Weekly Status Meeting

(I:\PROJECTS\722446\CORRESP\09209401.WPF\09/28/94)

1) Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

The team provided comments on the September 14, 1994 meeting minutes to Phil Nixon. Mr. Nixon will incorporate the comments and formally issue the meeting minutes.

Arturo Duran asked if the DOE response to the CDPHE comment concerning the discrepancy between the Haliburton and Weston data indicated that further sludge sampling was required. Andy Ledford and Harlen Ainscough agreed that further sampling was not desirable. Andy Ledford stated that Part II of the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document would be enhanced with a discussion concerning the sludge characterization. The proposed IM/IRA-EA Decision Document will include a summary of the sludge sampling methods, analytical methods, and results. It was discussed that the list of analytes for sludge should be compared with the list of analytes for the OU4 soils. Arturo Duran indicated that the EPA may be dissatisfied with the characterization results if the sludges were not analyzed for the contaminants known to be in the soils.

Andy Ledford clarified that Lockheed had analyzed the saltcrete because this waste is intended to be shipped to Envirocare, and characterization data were needed from a laboratory holding a Utah analytical certification.

Arturo Duran stated that responses to the Part V comments needed to be submitted to complete the September 12, 1994 deliverable that was identified during the dispute resolution. Phil Nixon stated that these comments were omitted because the Part V design had not been a component of the dispute resolution. Arturo Duran indicated that the responses to the Part V comments were required even though the post-closure monitoring was not an issue during the dispute. DOE agreed and ERM/G&M will submit responses to the comments.

2) Public Involvement Strategy

Andy Ledford informed the team that he had requested that the EG&G community relations group work with CDPHE and EPA public relations specialists. Arturo Duran stated that the EPA wanted to identify the key public groups. Andy Ledford responded that Frazer Lockhart considered the major public groups to be the following:

Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)
Technical Review Group (TRG)

Both of these groups are involved in the project and have copies of the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document. It was also discussed that Jefferson County is an important group that needs to remain informed.

Arturo Duran stated that during the public review period there is typically an informational meeting and a public hearing. Mr. Duran continued to say that perhaps technical issue focus

group sessions should also be held because the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document is so large. Peg Witherill stated that perhaps technical issue videos could be created for public dissemination in libraries and public reading rooms. This issue should be discussed by the community relations experts.

3) Resolution of the Preliminary Remediation Goal Issue

The preliminary remediation goal (PRG) issue was resolved. It was agreed that the PRG methodology would not be modified from the existing target organ approach. The EPA and CDPHE agreed that the PRGs are conservative. The IM/IRA-EA Decision Document will be modified to state that the PRG methodology was established by the DOE, CDPHE, and EPA working group as a project-specific conservative approach to determining the volume of soils that should be remediated. The methodology is not necessarily appropriate for other projects at the RFETS.

Arturo Duran stated that the protocol to access toxicity data from EPA headquarters is as follows:

1) Request data through the local EPA contact.

2) The local EPA contact evaluates the request.

3) The local EPA contact will assess whether the data are available locally, and forward the request to EPA headquarters if the data are not available.

Mr. Duran stated that the data ES requested should be available in the IRIS or HEAST databases. Phil Nixon indicated that these toxicity resources were used, but ES would look into whether there have been recent toxicity value updates.

4) Annexation of IHSS 176 by OU4

Andy Ledford stated that EG&G/DOE considered the annexation of IHSS 176 by OU4 appropriate based on:

1) Review of existing OU10 characterization data.

2) Review of the historical release report, which attributes most of the contamination to the OU4 source.

3) An OU10 technical memo indicating that hot spot removal and capping was the technical baseline for closure.

Andy Ledford asked what EPA/CDPHE would require to determine if additional characterization was needed. Mr. Ledford continued that the Phase II contract would be the mechanism to obtain additional characterization results (if necessary). Harlen Ainscough responded that the CDPHE requested the OU10 characterization results to evaluate whether adequate characterization had been performed. The CDPHE had been denied the data because the data had not been validated. Frazer Lockhart stated that he would look into getting the data so the OU4 team could assess its adequacy. The OU4 team will need to assess if any other contaminants of concern need to be evaluated for the OU10 area. The CDPHE will be interested in whether the OU10 sampling included surface soils and vadose zone soils. In addition, the analyte list will be investigated. Frazer Lockhart stated that OU4 intended to annex all of OU10 (with the possible exception of the area where OU10 and OU6 overlap).

Frazer Lockhart stated that DOE was looking for a RCRA waste storage facility for the contents of Building 964 (2,000 drums). If storage space is identified, then the building may be removed so that the engineered cover's footprint can be increased. This would allow a square engineered cover design.

The agenda for the next team meeting will include a briefing for the characterization data in OU10 and an update on whether storage space has been identified for the contents of Building 964.

5) Planning/Negotiating Revised IAG Milestones

It was agreed that the proposed agency review cycle prior to issuing the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document for public review would be deleted. It was also agreed that the proposed agency review cycle prior to issuing the final document (responding to public comments) would also be deleted. It was agreed that the EPA and CDPHE will have a general understanding of how the document will change by reviewing the responses to the comments and by attending team meetings.

Harlen Ainscough indicated that he needed time to assemble the Corrective Actions Management Unit (CAMU) permit modification/endorsement prepared for submittal to the public with the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document. Frazer Lockhart questioned whether it was necessary for the CDPHE to submit the CAMU endorsement paper with the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document. Harlen Ainscough responded that he would investigate the requirements of the CAMU permit modification/endorsement.

Additional days will be added for the agency approval period for a total of 21 days.

It was noted that CDPHE and EPA would review the document during the public review period.

Frazer Lockhart noted that in previous projects where the public was involved early, the number of comments was significantly reduced. Therefore, EG&G will consider reducing the period of time for preparing the responsiveness summary.

It was discussed that a real-time schedule would be prepared for the discussion at the next team meeting.

6) Excavation and Dust Control Briefing

Phil Nixon provided a briefing on the sequence of excavation for installation of the subsurface drain and what measures were being considered for dust control. Mr. Nixon indicated that the biggest constraint associated with the construction was the lack of available open space for stockpiling and storage. Therefore the excavation and piling of excavated soils has to be contained within the IHSS 101 area. This is also necessary so that contaminated materials do not leave the CAMU. Mr. Nixon stated that ES divided IHSS 101 into five zones for excavation sequencing. The excavation will commence in the zone where the excavation is the shallowest (SEP 207-B South). The excavated material will be piled in SEP 207-A. The subsurface drain will then be installed with subsequent pilings of excavated soils on other zones of the IHSS. As soon as the drain is completed, soils will be backfilled onto the subsurface drain, and excavation of a new zone will commence. This process will be continued until all five of the zones are completed. The final grade of consolidated materials will be established with mixtures of soil/liner and sludge/liner. This will put the "hazardous" materials as far from the water table as possible.

Dust will be suppressed throughout construction. During excavation, water sprays will be used. Once a stockpile is created (soils, liners) that will remain (for at least a few days), then a fixative solution will be sprayed on the pile so that water spraying will not have to continue on a routine basis.

Air monitoring will occur throughout the construction period. Monitoring will occur at the work site (to assess risk to workers), at the OU4 fence line (to assess risk to general site employees), and at the RFETS boundary (to assess risk to the offsite public). The monitoring results will be used to establish personal protective equipment for the workers and dust control measures.

8) Other Issues

Harlen Ainscough reported that he has asked DOE to perform RESRAD modeling on the project.

Philip A. Nixon

(I:\PROJECTS\722446\CORRESP\09209401.WPF\09/28/94)